

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
MICHAEL A. JACOBS (Bar No. 111664)
mjacobs@mofo.com
MARC DAVID PETERS (Bar No. 211725)
mdpeters@mofo.com
DANIEL P. MUINO (Bar No. 209624)
dmuino@mofo.com
755 Page Mill Road, Palo Alto, CA 94304-1018
Telephone: (650) 813-5600 / Facsimile: (650) 494-0799

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
DAVID BOIES (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
dboies@bsfllp.com
333 Main Street, Armonk, NY 10504
Telephone: (914) 749-8200 / Facsimile: (914) 749-8300
STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (Bar No. 144177)
sholtzman@bsfllp.com
FRED NORTON (Bar No. 224725)
fnorton@bsfllp.com
1999 Harrison St., Suite 900, Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (510) 874-1000 / Facsimile: (510) 874-1460
ALANNA RUTHERFORD (Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
575 Lexington Avenue, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-2300 / Facsimile: (212) 446-2350

ORACLE CORPORATION
DORIAN DALEY (Bar No. 129049)
dorian.daley@oracle.com
DEBORAH K. MILLER (Bar No. 95527)
deborah.miller@oracle.com
MATTHEW M. SARBORARIA (Bar No. 211600)
matthew.sarboraria@oracle.com
500 Oracle Parkway, Redwood City, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 506-5200 / Facsimile: (650) 506-7114

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.

Case No. CV 10-03561 WHA

Plaintiff,

**ORACLE AMERICA, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO
GOOGLE, INC.'S REQUEST FOR
CONTINUANCE [DKT. NO. 804]**

GOOGLE INC

Dept.: Courtroom 8, 19th Floor
Judge: The Honorable William H. Alsup

Defendant.

1 Oracle submits this opposition to Google's request for a one week continuance of the trial in this
 2 matter, from April 16 to April 23. (Dkt. No. 804.)

3 **I. Introduction**

4 Normally, Oracle would not hesitate to agree to a brief continuance to accommodate the
 5 schedule of opposing counsel. Professional as well as personal commitments frequently require that
 6 counsel ask for, as well as grant, such courtesies. Unfortunately, both Michael Jacobs and David Boies,
 7 Oracle's co-lead trial counsel in this case, as well as other key members of the Oracle trial team, also
 8 have other trial commitments that would be threatened if the trial were delayed even a week. In
 9 particular, Mr. Jacobs has a trial set to begin May 31, and Mr. Boies has trials set to begin June 4, June
 10 18, and June 25. As a result, changing the trial date to accommodate the schedule of Mr. Van Nest and
 11 other members of the Google trial team would necessarily cause equally significant conflicts for Mr.
 12 Jacobs, Mr. Boies, and other members of the Oracle trial team.

13 Further, it appears that a continuance would threaten to cause, rather than resolve, a conflict for
 14 Mr. Van Nest. If trial of *Oracle v. Google* is delayed one week, and lasts eight weeks, it will end on
 15 Friday, June 15. As stated in Google's motion, Mr. Van Nest is to commence trial in the *Genentech*
 16 matter before Judge Koh on Monday, June 11. Although Judge Koh has requested that the parties in
 17 that case agree to a two-week continuance, the defendant in that case has objected on the grounds that
 18 its own trial counsel from Irell & Manella are to begin yet another trial in Florida on July 2.

19 It thus appears that the only eight-week window when Mr. Van Nest currently has no other trial
 20 commitments is the one that begins April 16. An April 16 trial date provides the best opportunity for
 21 lead counsel and other counsel for *both* parties to fulfill existing June commitments set by other courts
 22 in other cases; an April 23 start date does not. Google's motion for a continuance should be denied.

23 **II. Background**

24 Oracle's co-lead trial counsel in this case are Michael Jacobs and David Boies. (Declaration of
 25 Michael Jacobs ("Jacobs Decl.") at ¶ 3; Declaration of David Boies ("Boies Decl.") at ¶ 3.)

26 **Michael Jacobs's Trial Commitments**

27 As disclosed in the parties' joint pretrial conference statement, Mr. Jacobs is lead counsel in *In*
 28 *the Matter of Certain Electronic Digital Media Devices and Components Thereof*, Investigation No.

1 337-TA-796, before the ITC. That matter is set for trial from May 31 to June 6. (Dkt. No. 644, at 4;
 2 Jacobs Decl. ¶ 4.)

3 Mr. Jacobs is also lead trial counsel in *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et. al.*, Case
 4 No. 11-cv-01846-LHK, in this district, which is scheduled for trial beginning on July 30. That trial is
 5 expected to last 3 to 4 weeks. (Jacobs Decl. ¶ 5.)

6 **David Boies's Trial Commitments**

7 Mr. Boies is lead trial counsel for the defendant in *Invista B.V., et al. v. E.I du Pont de Nemours*
 8 *and Company*, 08 Civ. 3063 (SHS) (S.D.N.Y.). On September 27, 2011, Judge Stein set that case for
 9 trial starting on June 4, 2012, and that trial is expected to continue until July. (Boies Decl. at ¶ 6;
 10 *Invista B.V., et al. v. E.I du Pont de Nemours and Co.*, 08 Civ. 3063, Dkt. No. 156.)

11 Mr. Boies is also lead trial counsel for Oracle in another case proceeding in this District, *Oracle*
 12 *USA, Inc. v. SAP AG*, No. C07-1658-PJH, before Judge Hamilton. On February 28, 2012, Judge
 13 Hamilton scheduled that case for trial on June 18, 2012; it will likely last two to three weeks. (Boies
 14 Decl. at ¶ 7; *Oracle USA, Inc. v. SAP AG*, No. C07-1658-PJH, Dkt. No 1110.) Oracle had objected to
 15 the proposed June 18 trial date, specifically citing this Court's direction to keep April 16 to late June
 16 free for trial of this case. (See *Oracle USA, Inc. v. SAP AG*, No. C07-1658-PJH, Dkt. No. 1109, at 1–2.)
 17 The trial team in that matter includes Steven C. Holtzman, Fred Norton, and Beko Reblitz-Richardson,
 18 each of whom is a key member of the trial team in this case as well. Judge Hamilton has agreed that the
 19 *SAP* trial will trail the previously scheduled *DuPont* trial. (Boies Decl. at ¶ 7.)

20 Mr. Boies is also lead trial counsel for plaintiffs in *Rincon EV Realty LLC, et. al. v. CP III*
 21 *Rincon Towers, Inc., et. al.*, No. CGC 10-496887, in California state court in San Francisco. On
 22 February 24, 2012, the court in that matter set that case to commence trial on June 25, 2012, rejecting
 23 plaintiffs' request for a trial beginning in July. That trial will likely last two to three weeks. (Boies
 24 Decl. at ¶ 8.)

25 Mr. Boies is also lead trial counsel for the defendants in *Capital One Financial Corp. v. Kanas*,
 26 No. 1:11-cv-750 (LO/TRJ) (E.D. Va.). That case is set for trial on July 23, 2012 and is likely to last one
 27 week to two weeks. (Boies Decl. at ¶ 9.)

28 //

1 **Mr. Van Nest's Trial Commitments**

2 As stated in Google's brief, Mr. Van Nest is lead counsel for plaintiffs in the matter of
 3 *Genentech Inc. v. Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania*, N.D. Cal. No. 5:10-cv-02037 LHK
 4 (PSG). As the Court is aware, Judge Koh has suggested to the parties in that case that their trial be
 5 delayed two weeks, from June 11 to June 18. Google's brief states that, “[a]ssuming the *Genentech*
 6 trial is in fact delayed two weeks, there would exist an available eight-week window from April 23 to
 7 June 15 in which the Court could try this case.” (Mot., at 2, Dkt. No. 804.) The defendant in the
 8 *Genentech* case, however, has since informed Judge Koh that it cannot agree to the two week deferral
 9 of that trial, because its own trial counsel, from Irell & Manella, are to begin yet another trial on July 2,
 10 2012 in the Middle District of Florida. (*See Genentech Inc. v. Trustees of the University of*
 11 *Pennsylvania*, N.D. Cal. No. 5:10-cv-02037 LHK (PSG), Dkt. No. 522.)

12 Accordingly, it appears that maintaining this case's current start date of April 16 would allow
 13 Mr. Van Nest to appear at each of the three trials he has committed to, in their entirety, even if the trial
 14 of this case lasts a full eight weeks. If the start of this trial is delayed until April 23, and the trial lasts
 15 the full eight weeks that the Court has allotted, Mr. Van Nest must either miss the end of this trial or the
 16 start of the *Genentech* trial.

17 **III. Argument**

18 All of the lead counsel in this case have very busy trial calendars. It is simply not possible for
 19 the Court to change the trial date to avoid inconvenience to Mr. Van Nest and other Google trial team
 20 members without causing a still greater inconvenience to Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Boies, and other members of
 21 the Oracle trial team.¹

22 If this trial begins on April 16 and last eight weeks, it will conclude on June 8, the Friday before
 23 Mr. Van Nest is to begin the *Genentech* trial, assuming that trial is not continued. But if the trial begins
 24 on April 23 and lasts eight weeks, it will conclude on June 15, the Friday before Mr. Boies, Mr.
 25 Holtzman, Mr. Norton, and Mr. Reblitz-Richardson are to begin the *Oracle v. SAP* trial. (Boies Decl. ¶

26 ¹ Google cites a single case in support of its motion, *Felder v. Puthuff*, C-93-20303-RPA (EAI), 1995
 27 WL 16821 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 13, 1995). In *Felder*, however, the attorney with a conflicting trial
 28 commitment submitted a declaration stating that no other attorney from his law firm could become
 sufficiently familiar with the case in order to replace him as trial counsel by the date set for trial. *Id.* at
 *3.

7.) Google's motion would not eliminate the problem of successive trials – it would simply shift some of the burden from one of Google's lawyers to four of Oracle's lawyers.

Moreover, both Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Boies have other trials that are scheduled to begin during the eight-week period of this trial. These trial dates were set in 2011, before this Court’s admonition to keep April through June free for trial of this case. (See Jacobs Decl. ¶ 4; Boies Decl. ¶ 6.) If the *Oracle v. Google* trial begins on April 16, it is possible, consistent with the time limits previously established by the Court, and allowing time for jury deliberations, that all three phases of trial in this case would conclude in time for Mr. Jacobs to appear for the first day of trial in his ITC matter on May 31, for Mr. Boies to appear for the first day of trial in the *Invista* matter on June 4, and for Mr. Van Nest to appear for the first day of trial in the *Genentech* matter on June 11. If the trial is delayed a week, it is all but impossible for Mr. Jacobs to avoid a trial conflict, and it is significantly more likely that Mr. Boies and Mr. Van Nest will find themselves double-booked as well.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Oracle respectfully requests that the Court deny Google's motion for a continuance.

Dated: March 19, 2012

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP

By: /s/ Steven C. Holtzman
Steven C. Holtzman

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ORACLE AMERICA, INC.